



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                                                                                                  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.           | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| 09/971,717                                                                                                       | 10/04/2001  | David Ian Houlding   | 92717-319                     | 3038             |
| 7590                                                                                                             | 12/13/2005  |                      | EXAMINER<br>SHIFERAW, ELENI A |                  |
| Gary B. Solomon<br>Jenkens & Gilchrist, P.C.<br>3200 Fountain Place<br>1445 Ross Avenue<br>Dallas, TX 75202-2799 |             |                      | ART UNIT<br>2136              | PAPER NUMBER     |
| DATE MAILED: 12/13/2005                                                                                          |             |                      |                               |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
|                              | 09/971,717             | HOULDING, DAVID IAN |
| Examiner                     | Eleni A. Shiferaw      | Art Unit<br>2136    |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### **Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2005.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 1-13, 15-22 and 24-26 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) 14 and 23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-13, 15-22 and 24-26 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All    b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on September 23, 2005 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 12, 13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chopra (Pub. No.: US 2002/0128920 A1) in view of Doyle et al. (Doyle, Patent Number: 5,838,906).

As per claim 12, Chopra teaches a system for providing security to a client computing system operating a browser in communication with an interactive software application maintained by a host computing system, said system comprising:

at least one processor in the client computing system operable to generate and communicate a request to download the interactive software application from the host computing system to the client computing system (Chopra page 1 par. 0007); and

a memory operating in the client computing system to store the interactive software application downloaded in response to the download request, said at least one processor executing the stored interactive software application and the browser on the client computing system (Chopra page 2 par. 0019, and page 3 par. 0024); and

Chopra fails to explicitly teach the interactive software application and the browser being in communication with at least one element outside the browser operating on the client computing system when executed and wherein at least one element includes a component of an underlying architecture of the client computing system.

However Doyle discloses an interactive software application/hypermedia in the browser provided to user's computer allowing the user to locate and retrieve program objects and interact with an other application program located at a remote computer (col. 6 lines 50-col. 7 lines 39 and col. 16 lines 9-27).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to employ the teachings of Doyle within the system of Chopra because it is well-known for the interactive applications in the browser to communicate outside the browser when executed/selected by a user (col. 6 lines 50-col. 7 lines 39 and col. 16 lines 9-27). One would have been motivated to do so because it would allow communicating with other application and providing data.

As per claim 13 Chopra and Doyle teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Chopra teaches the method/system, wherein the communication includes issuing and receiving events (Chopra page 1 par. 0007).

As per claim 15 Chopra and Doyle teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Chopra teaches the method/system, wherein the interactive software application is a Java applet (Chopra page 6 claim 36).

4. Claims 1-11, 14, and 16-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chopra (Pub. No.: US 2002/0128920 A1) in view of Doyle et al. (Doyle, Patent Number: 5,838,906), and Brownell (Pub. No.: US 2002/0169980 A1).

As per claims 1 and 26 Chopra teaches a method for providing security to a client computing system in communication with a host communication system across a network, said method comprising:

executing a browser on the client computing system (Chopra page 2 par. 0019);  
communicating from the client to the host computing system (Chopra Fig. 1 No. 102 & 106), a request to download data to be displayed in the browser (Chopra page 1 par. 0007);  
downloading the data from the host computing system to the client computing system (Chopra page 3 par. 0024);  
loading an interactive software application in the browser, the interactive software application utilizing the data downloaded from the host computing system (Chopra page 3 par. 0024); and

executing the interactive software application in the browser on the client computing system, the interactive software application being in communication with at least one element on the client side (Chopra page 2 par. 0019, and page 3 par. 0024);

Chopra does not explicitly teach client side firewall.

However Brownell discloses client side firewall (Brownell Page 5 par. 0056).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of Brownell within the system of Chopra because it would allow to specify that network traffic from one source be blocked, network traffic from another source be rerouted to another network, user profile data and data available through user authentication service (Brownell page 5 par. 0056).

Chopra and Brownell fail to explicitly teach the interactive software application and the browser being in communication with at least one element outside the browser operating on the client computing system when executed and wherein at least one element includes a component of an underlying architecture of the client computing system.

However Doyle discloses an interactive software application/hypermedia in the browser provided to user's computer allowing the user to locate and retrieve program objects and interact with an other application program located at a remote computer (col. 6 lines 50-col. 7 lines 39 and col. 16 lines 9-27).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to employ the teachings of Doyle within the combination system of Chopra and Brownell because it is well-known for the interactive applications in the browser to communicate outside the browser when executed/selected by a user (col. 6 lines 50-col. 7 lines

39 and col. 16 lines 9-27). One would have been motivated to do so because it would allow communicating with other application and providing data.

As per claim 19 Chopra teaches a method for providing security to a client computing system operating an interactive software application, said method comprising:

loading the interactive software application on the client computing system (Chopra page 3 par. 0024);

executing the interactive software application in a browser on the client computing system (Chopra page 1 par. [0006-0007], and page 3 par. 0024); and

communicating data between the at least one element and browser on the client computing system (Chopra page 2 par. 0019, and page 3 par. 0024);

Chopra does not disclose communicating a digital signature to the browser;

verifying the digital signature;

upon confirmation of the digital signature, opening a port of the browser for receiving data from at least one element;

However Brown teaches communicating a digital signature to the browser (Brownell page 6 par. 0072 and page 4 par. [0050-0054]);

verifying the digital signature (Brownell page 6 par. 0075 and page 4 par. [0050-0054]);

upon confirmation of the digital signature, opening a port of the browser for receiving data from at least one element (Brownell page 6 par. 0072 and page 4 par. [0050-0054]);

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of Brownell within the system of Chopra

because it would allow to authenticate and verify a user to further improve security (Brownell page 6 par. 0072).

Chopra and Brownell fail to explicitly teach communication data with at least one element outside the browser operating on the client computing system when executed and wherein at least one element includes a component of an underlying architecture of the client computing system.

However Doyle discloses an interactive software application/hypermedia in the browser provided to user's computer allowing the user to locate and retrieve program objects and interact with an other application program located at a remote computer (col. 6 lines 50-col. 7 lines 39 and col. 16 lines 9-27).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to employ the teachings of Doyle within the combination system of Chopra and Brownell because it is well-known for the interactive applications in the browser to communicate outside the browser when executed/selected by a user (col. 6 lines 50-col. 7 lines 39 and col. 16 lines 9-27). One would have been motivated to do so because it would allow communicating with other application and providing data.

As per claim 2 Chopra, Brownell and Doyle teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Chopra teaches the method/system, wherein the communication includes issuing and receiving events (Chopra page 1 par. 0007).

As per claims 3 and 14 Chopra, Brownell and Doyle teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition, teaches the method/system, wherein the at least one element includes at least one of a browser and an element of an underlying architecture (Chopra page 2 par. 0019, and Brownell page 4 par. 0050).

As per claims 4, and 5 Chopra, Brownell and Doyle teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Chopra teaches the method/system, wherein the interactive software application is a Java applet (Chopra page 6 claim 36).

As per claims 6, 16 and 22 Chopra, Brownell and Doyle teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Brownell teaches the method/system, wherein the communication commences after verification of a digital signature, digital signature associated with the host (Brownell page 6 par. 0072 & 0075). The rational for combining are the same as claim 19 above.

As per claim 7 Chopra, Brownell and Doyle teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Brownell teaches the method/system, further comprising:

reading a digital signature (Brownell page 6 par. 0072 and page 4 par. [0050-0054]);  
verifying the digital signature (Brownell page 6 par. 0075 and page 4 par. [0050-0054]);

and

opening a port of the browser to receive events from the at least one element (Brownell page 6 par. 0072 and page 4 par. [0050-0054]). The rational for combining are the same as claim 19 above.

As per claims 8 and 17 Chopra, Brownell and Doyle teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition, the method/system, wherein the data includes a model representative of an underlying architecture of a software system (Chopra page 3 par. 0024, and Brownell page 4 par. 0050).

As per claim 9, Chopra, Brownell and Doyle teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Chopra teaches the method, wherein the browser operates a graphical user interface to display data communicated by the at least one element (Chopra page 2 par. 0017).

As per claim 10, Chopra, Brownell and Doyle teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Chopra teaches the method, wherein the data includes content and format information (Chopra page 3 par. 0024).

As per claims 11, 18, and 25, Chopra, Brownell and Doyle teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition, the method/system, wherein the browser is a web browser (Chopra page 2 par. 0019, and Brownell page 4 par. 0050).

As per claim 20, Chopra, Brownell and Doyle teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Chopra teaches the method, wherein the data includes at least one of events and requests (Chopra page 1 par. [0006-0007]).

As per claim 21, Chopra, Brownell and Doyle teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Chopra teaches the method, wherein the events and requests utilize the HTTP protocol (Chopra page 2 par. 0019).

As per claim 23, Chopra, Brownell and Doyle teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Chopra teaches the method, wherein the at least one element is at least one of a second browser and component of an underlying architecture (Chopra page 3 par. 0024, and Brownell page 4 par. 0050).

As per claim 24, Chopra, Brownell and Doyle teach all the subject matter as described above. In addition Brownell teaches the method, wherein the at least one element operates on the client side of a client firewall (Brownell page 5 par. 0056). The rational for combining is the same as claim 19 above.

*Conclusion*

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eleni A. Shiferaw whose telephone number is 571-272-3867. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

E.S  
Elan Seng  
12/8/05

Cell  
Primary Examiner  
AU2131  
1219105